

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7730

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ELENA VON BRESSENSDORF, a/k/a Elena Bisheff,
a/k/a Baroness,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 03-7731

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

OTTO VON BRESSENSDORF, a/k/a Baron Otto Von
Bressensdorf, a/k/a Baron, a/k/a Ottone Eugeno
Camelio Bresselhau,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District
Judge. (CR-98-14; CA-02-223; CA-02-224)

Submitted: February 25, 2004

Decided: March 10, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Elena Von Bressensdorf, Otto Von Bressensdorf, Appellants Pro Se. Andrew Gerald McBride, WILEY, REIN & FIELDING, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Gurney Wingate Grant, II, James Brien Comey, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia; Dana Johannes Finberg, MCCANDLISH HOLTON, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Otto and Elena von Bressensdorf seek to appeal the district court's order denying their 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motions. The von Bressensdorfs cannot appeal unless a circuit judge or justice issues a certificate of appealability, and a certificate of appealability will not issue absent a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A § 2255 movant meets this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 326 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude the von Bressensdorfs have not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED